

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 are amended. Claims 7 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 23 and 24 have been added. Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-24 are pending.

I. Claim amendments

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite "by second-harmonic generation due to non-linearity of the wavelength converting device". This amendment is supported by the original disclosure, for example, page 8, lines 10-33.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite a light separator, and a detector that detects the wavelength of the first light and a controller that controls the first light. These amendments are supported by the original disclosure, for example original claims 1 and 5, the description of the elements 7, 17, 22, etc. and page 10, lines 2-16.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite a light separator which is supported by the original disclosure in the same manner as for claim 1. Additional amendments have been made to claim 5 to improve its form, and these additional amendments are supported by the original disclosure.

Claims 6 and 17 have been amended to recite that the wavelength of the first light is detected after the first light has passed through the wavelength converting device. This amendment is supported by the original disclosure, for example Figure 1.

Claims 7 and 18 have been canceled as a result of the amendments made to claims 1 and 5.

Claims 8 and 13 have been amended as a result of the amendments to claim 1.

Claim 14 has been amended to correct the word "electrooptic".

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended as a result of the amendments to claim 5.

New claims 23 and 24 are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 9, lines 20-22.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

On May 17, 2004, Applicants submitted a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement citing an additional reference. Applicant's request that the cited reference be considered and that the Examiner return a copy of Form 1449 with the reference initialed as being considered.

III. 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are complete. Claim 1 has been amended to recite how the first light is converted, a light separator, and a detector for detecting the wavelength of the first light and a controller controlling the first light. Claim 5 has been amended to recite how the first light is converted and a light separator. Applicants note that claim 5 already recites a first mechanism that detects and controls the wavelength of the first light.

Applicants do not concede that the previous claims were in fact "incomplete".

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

IV. 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-12 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,936,985 to Yamamoto et al. (Yamamoto) in view of U.S. Patent 4,939,388 to Eaton et al. (Eaton).

Claims 8, 10, 13-16 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto and Eaton, in view of U.S. Patent 5,960,259 to Kitaoka et al. (Kitaoka).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As recognized by the Examiner, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest a coherent light source that detects the first light. Nor does Yamamoto teach or suggest a coherent light source that detects and controls the first light in order to control the wavelength of the second light.

Eaton is relied upon to teach splitting a light into two and detecting each light. Eaton splits a beam into two using a beam splitter 6 in order to evaluate a sample 5 using detectors 8, 10 in the form of photomultipliers. Eaton does not control the wavelength of the first beam based on the detection of any one of the split beams.

There is simply no suggestion contained in either Yamamoto or Eaton to combine these two references in the manner suggested. The two references are from differing technologies. Yamamoto discloses a system for use in optical information processing and optical application measurement control, having a laser source 100 and a wavelength conversion device 22a (column 1, lines 8-13; column 8, lines 40-41). Eaton discloses a system for evaluating organic

Serial No.: 10/041,780  
Group Art Unit: 2828

complexes, that utilizes a laser 1 (column 1, lines 7-10; column 3, lines 46-51). The system in Eaton does not utilize a wavelength conversion device and is not useful for optical information processing and optical application measurement control. As a result, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Eaton seeking to combine it with Yamamoto.

Further, Eaton does not teach detecting and controlling the first light rather than the second light. Even though Eaton may teach detecting split beams, Eaton does not teach a second light converted by a wavelength conversion device, or any control of the first light based on detection of either beam. Therefore, there is no teaching to detect and control the first light in Yamamoto.

Therefore, claims 1 and 5 are patentable over Yamamoto and Eaton.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-17, and 19-24 depend from either claim 1 or claim 5, and are patentable along with those claims and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants do not concede the propriety of the rejections to the dependent claims and reserve the right to separately address each dependent claim at a later date.

#### V. Conclusion

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions or concerns regarding this communication can be addressed to the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,  
**MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.**  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 332-5300  
By   
Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM/JAL

Dated: July 21, 2004